

REMARKS

Applicant and applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on October 27, 2006, wherein a number of the claims were discussed. Reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified application are now respectfully requested. Claims 30–53 are pending, wherein claims 30, 32, 33, 47, and 50 are amended and new claims 51–53 have been added.

Explicit and implicit support for these new claims can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. Including for example, specification paragraphs 42 and 56-64, original claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 20, 25, 32, 33 and 42, and drawing figure numbers 2, 3-6, 8-9, and the discussion relating thereto.

Claims 30 and 50 have been amended to more specifically claim that the dehydrated reef organism comprises a dehydrated marine animal. The molding process of the present invention is particularly useful when forming molds of marine animals. Rather than placing a soft-bodied marine animal directly on a reef-like formation, then molding the resulting shape, claim 30 is directed to a method of first providing a reef-organism structure by employing a dehydrated marine animal in a molding process and adhering the reef-organism structure to the reef-like formation to produce a reef artifact form. This method conveniently enables the reef-organism structure to be adhered to the reef-like formation before the final mold is prepared.

None of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest producing a “reef artifact form” from a “dehydrated marine animal”. Although *Hudson* teaches covering a dome with “living coral species” (col. 6, l. 45), there is no teaching or suggestion that these “living coral species” could be or should be “dehydrated” as required by claims 30 and 50. In particular, the “living coral species” referred to in *Hudson* cannot be a “dehydrated marine animal” since

dehydrating a coral would kill the animal. The fact that *Hudson* states that the coral are "living" suggests that these coral are not "dehydrated marine animals" as required by claims 30 and 50.

There is also no motivation to modify *Virgili*, alone or in combination with *Hudson*, to arrive at the methods claimed in claims 30 and 50. Claims 30 and 50 require molding the "dehydrated marine animals" to make a "reef-organism structure" and in a separate step making a mold of the "reef-organism structure" after they have been adhered to the "reef-like formation." There is no motivation in *Virgili*, alone or in combination with *Hudson*, to make a mold of a "dehydrated marine animal" because the objects being adhered in *Virgili* and *Hudson* (i.e., stones, rocks, and living coral species) are hard and could be directly applied to a form. In contrast, Applicant's invention advantageously allows dehydrated soft bodied organisms to be used in the molding process.

Claim 47 has been amended to more specifically claim the use of "a mounting bracket" in conjunction with the reef artifact such that the reef artifact can be mounted on a structure. Claim 47 requires that the "mounting bracket" be "configured to mount the reef artifact on a structure that is at least partially submerged in water and receives a shock from water moving toward the structure." *Virgili*, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest incorporating a "mounting bracket configured to mount the reef artifact on a structure that is at least partially submerged in water and receives a shock from water moving toward the structure."

New claim 51 is similar to newly amended claim 47 except that claim 51 also requires "mounting the reef artifact on a structure that is at least partially submerged in water and receives a shock from water moving toward the structure, the reef artifact being configured to disrupt the flow of the water adjacent thereto such that the reef artifact absorbs at least a portion of the shock of the water moving toward the structure." *Virgili*, alone or in combination, does not teach or

suggest "mounting the reef artifact on a structure that is at least partially submerged in water and receives a shock from water moving toward the structure."

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22nd day of November, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/ANDREW S. HANSEN/
ANDREW S. HANSEN
Registration No. 56,370
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

ASH:ajb
MLA0000004544V001